22679

## BEFORE THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Office of Proceedings

MAR 29 2010

Part of Public Record

STB DOCKET NO. AB-1043 (Sub-No. 1)

MONTREAL, MAINE & ATLANTIC RAILWAY, LTD --DISCONTINUANCE OF SERVICE AND ABANDONMENT --IN AROOSTOOK AND PENOBSCOT COUNTIES, MAINE

RESPONSE OF IRVING WOODLANDS LLC AND IRVING FOREST PRODUCTS, INC. TO THE REPLY OF THE MONTREAL, MAINE & ATLANTIC RAILWAY, LTD TO MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF FILING DEADLINES

Irving Woodlands LLC and Irving Forest Products, Inc. (collectively, "Irving") hereby respond to the Reply of the Montreal, Maine & Atlantic Railway, Ltd. ("MMA") to the Motion for Extension of Filing Deadlines ("Motion") for the limited purpose of addressing a factual misrepresentation made by MMA. MMA opposes the Motion, in part, on grounds that an extension is unnecessary because MMA has "actively cooperated in providing information requested to date by other parties with an interest in this proceeding, such as Irving Woodlands LLC and Irving Forest Products, Inc." MMA Reply, ¶ 3. To date, however, MMA has provided very little information to Irving and has done so in a protracted and drawn out manner that has consumed valuable time in this compact procedural schedule.

First, MMA filed a public version of its Application that heavily over-redacted clearly public information. MMA has since agreed to redesignate a significant portion of its Application from "Highly Confidential" to "Confidential," but only after two weeks of negotiations with Irving. Although Irving contends that much of that "Confidential" information should in fact be designated as "Public," that would require an expenditure of scarce time and resources to argue

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Although the Board typically does not permit a reply to a reply, it has permitted them when necessary to have a complete record.

the issue before the Board and provide no greater benefit to Irving than is already provided by the "Confidential" designations to which MMA has agreed. Consequently, however, the public will never see information to which it clearly is entitled.

Second, the "Highly Confidential" version of MMA's Application does not identify what information has been designated "Highly Confidential." Such designations typically are made by bracketing or highlighting the "Highly Confidential" text. In the absence of such identification, the reader cannot tell which text is "Highly Confidential" without reading the "Public" and "Highly Confidential" versions side by side. This is an additional time consuming burden upon all parties and the Board.

Third, MMA has been highly resistant to providing the spreadsheets and computer runs in its Application in their native computer format. Despite the presence of a protective order in this proceeding, MMA has raised objections based upon the proprietary nature of the programs used by its consultants. In addition, MMA either is unaware of, or has chosen to ignore, the Board's admonition that: "Where a party is submitting computer evidence, it is important that the underlying data used in the analysis (including programs and programming method, and all relevant computer inputs and outputs) be made available so that opposing parties may assess and comment on the validity of such evidence." Utility Fuels, Inc. v. Burlington Northern Railroad Company et al., Docket 39002, 1984 ICC Lexis 407 at \*19 (June 29, 1984) (internal quote omitted). Only today has MMA provided even a portion of its Excel spreadsheet files to Irving, and then for just a single witness. If MMA does not provide its electronic files in their native format, more time will be lost to a Motion to Compel. However, even if MMA does ultimately produce these files, this type of stalling still will have consumed valuable time. This is an abuse of an expedited process that Congress surely did not envision.

MMA's claim of "active cooperation" is misleading at best, and disingenuous at worst.

Its cooperation has been reluctant, incomplete, and dilatory, which is a principal reason why an extension of the procedural schedule is needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Karyn A. Booth Jeffrey O. Moreno

David E. Benz

Thompson Hine LLP

1920 N Street, N.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20036 202.263.4108

202.331.8330 (fax)

Attorneys for Irving Woodlands LLC and, Irving Forest Products, Inc.

March 29, 2010

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 29th day of March, 2010 I caused a copy of the foregoing to be served by e-mail or by first class mail, postage prepaid upon the following:

James E. Howard
1 Thompson Square, Suite 201
Charlestown, MA 02129
jim@jehowardlaw.com

Toni L. Kemmerle
Chief Counsel
Department of Transportation, State of Maine
16 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0016
toni.kemmerle@maine.gov

Eric M. Hocky
Thorp Reed & Armstrong LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 1000
Philadelphia, PA 19103
ehocky@thorpreed.com

Linda J. Morgan
Charles H.P. Vance
Covington & Burling LLP
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004-2401
lmorgan@cov.com
cvance@cov.com

Donald G. Avery
Peter Pfohl
Slover & Loftus
1224 Seventeenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-3003
dga@slvoerandloftus.com
pap@sloverandloftus.com

Scott G. Knudson Briggs and Morgan, PA 2200 IDS Center 80 South 8th Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 sknudson@briggs.com

Arkon Horne Fraser Papers P.O. Box 749 Ashland, ME 04732 arkon@ftl.fraserpapers.com

John Cashwell
Portage Wood Products, LLC
P.O. Box 156
Portage, ME 04768
jcashwell@sevenislands.com

Honorable Susan M. Collins United States Senate 413 Dirksen Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510

Honorable Michael H. Michaud United States House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Honorable James L. Oberstar United States House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

David E. Benz